

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-07591-CRB](#) (JSC)

**ORDER RE: WALGREENS' MOTION
TO COMPEL SUPPLEMENTAL
30(B)(6) TESTIMONY**

Re: Dkt. No. 1036

Pending before the Court is a discovery dispute joint letter from Plaintiff and Walgreens regarding Walgreens' request for additional 30(b)(6) testimony. (Dkt. No. 1036.) Oral argument is not required.

1. **Additional 30(b)(6) Testimony.** Walgreens seeks an additional hour of 30(b)(6) testimony on the grounds that the witness was unprepared to discuss pharmacy policies during the 2006 to 2009 timeframe. Walgreens contends that it asked the witness: "Q Do you have any information about topics 7, 8, 9, and 10 relating to the 2006 to 2010 time frame? A No." (Dkt. No. 1036 at 1.) What Walgreens omits, however, is that before this question was asked, the witness testified as to the investigation she conducted into the 2006 and 2010 time frame. (Dkt. No. 1036-7 at 3-6.) She was unable to uncover any information. She has now offered a declaration that states as the 30(b)(6) witness that she is unaware of any material differences between the policies she testified to and those between 2006 and 2009. (Dkt. No. 1036-6.) Walgreens' request is DENIED.

2. **Supplemental 30(b)(6) Written Responses.** Plaintiff has supplemented its responses to address Walgreens' concern. (Dkt. No. 1036-5.) Walgreens' request is DENIED.

This Order disposes of Docket No. 1036.

United States District Court
Northern District of California

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 15, 2022


JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States Magistrate Judge